

Message

From: Kay, Robert [rtkay@usgs.gov]
Sent: 2/26/2013 6:31:42 PM
To: Nordine, John [nordine.john@epa.gov]
Subject: Techalloy #2

Trends in P&T Influent Concentrations: again, these graphs need to be improved. I'm not sure why Techalloy feels that because these are e-mails, that submitting flawed packages is acceptable. This information goes in the public record and should be of a quality that reflects this status. This comment applies to pretty much everything Techalloy has and will provide to EPA.

The top plot is somewhat OK, but would benefit from "Concentration, in micrograms per liter" as the Y axis label and should have some sort of dot to denote the actual date the sample was collected, use of just lines leaves the actual sampling date unclear. remember, plots should be fully explanatory, stand alone presentations of data. we may now what "conc'n" means, but that doesn't mean other readers will.

The middle plot needs a better title, so the reader knows which well this data comes from. it also needs the improvements suggested for the top graph.

Bottom plot also needs improvements suggested for the top graph.

Note VOC concentrations are down in well 1, and generally up in well 2. Well 2 is southwest of Well 1 and less in line with the area of geoprobe investigation than well 1 is. Definition of the location and extent of the plume west of well 2 and south of the geoprobed area should be done.

GENERAL COMMENT ON ALL THE PLOTS OF WELL DATA. I didn't go into every comment on every plot, but most or all of the plots could stand improvement. Techalloy should check to make sure all of the graph titles (they tend to vary from well to well) and axis titles/labels, what data is presented in the tables, etc. are consistent and correct. They should re-check the data to make sure the plots are accurate. I've noted issues on some plots, but Techalloy should make sure all comments are appropriately applied to all the graphs.

MW-2.xls--previous comments about axis labels and highlighting the sample dates apply. Plot the TCA data, there are at least 2 MCL exceedences according to the table. Some of the subsequent tables present all/most of the chlorinated ethene and ethane results, even if non-detects. Consider doing that for all the wells so the reader knows what was analyzed for. This data presentation alongside the plots isn't necessary if all the data is presented in a table in the reports, but it needs to be somewhere the reader can check it.

What's going on with the tables presented above the plots? They seem to show inorganic data for "Tech" series wells that have no apparent relation to the wells being plotted. Techalloy needs to re-present these data in a clear way.

MW4.xls--this is how the y-axis title and the data plots should look. However, the boxes on the x-axis should be gotten rid of, as should the concentration data and the poor placement of the axis title. In addition, the numbers on the graph and the numbers on the table don't match. This data needs to be corrected and re-presented.

MW5.xls--consider requiring plotting the j-95 data. It'll expand the graph and make the other data a bit harder to follow (unless the graph scale is expanded) but it'll improve the data coverage.

Revise the title. It's incorrect as written.

DGW-1I: plot the early data.

DGW-1D: plot the D-12 data.

December 2012 Monthly Progress Report

Again, the data to be presented in the appendices needs to be complete and properly presented. A figure showing the location of all of these wells also needs to be presented with this report.

Techalloy has taken a first step to providing what we need, but it needs to be improved.

We also may want to discuss if a monthly report is the proper format for presenting this data. I don't know if we agreed to a format when we talked in January, and I don't necessarily have a problem with presenting this information in a monthly report providing it is a comprehensive presentation of the data and is updated whenever new data becomes available. However, we also asked for some analysis of the data, and it isn't here. If Techalloy is going to use this report to provide their "state of the site" analysis, they need to discuss the state of the site, not just present the data.